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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to establish how students’ family socio-economic status influenced their participation in public secondary schools in Siaya County. The researcher used mixed methods approach and descriptive data was collected. The target population was 21,017 comprised of 276 school principals, 6 sub-county directors of education and 20,735 form IV students with a sample size of 2,160. The researcher adopted stratified simple random sampling technique to get respondents from categories of the schools. Data collection instruments were questionnaires, interview schedules and document analysis. Both descriptive and inferential data analysis methods were used in analyzing data. The study findings established that students’ family socio-economic status had a significant influence on students’ participation in public secondary school in Siaya County.

Objective of the Study
The objective of the study was to examine the influence of family socio-economic status on students’ participation in public secondary schools in Siaya County, Kenya.

Literature Review
Parents’ support in provision of conducive home environment can be viewed as their participation in education related activities since it determines how the children perform in education since some of what a child learns from home reinforces what is taught at school. Parents in that instance should show some concern about school work by supervising homework and providing guidance as children go through their studies (Fiore, 2001 & Thomson, 2018). Mwangi et al. (2017) observes that environment may be classified as urban or rural environment and it entails objects, materials, parents, siblings, peers and social life which exists in homes that influence
behaviour and performance of students and therefore they constitute the home environmental factors. This is because children of educated parents get exposed to reading materials early and there is strong correlation between school and home hence these students settle down to school work faster than children who are unfamiliar with books. Mwangi et al. (2017) concludes that Africans tend to have large and extended families which over stretches family finances since the family is interested in getting family’s daily upkeep from available resources. This leaves the family with little resources to be invested in education.

Thomson (2018) acknowledged that parents’ occupational and educational levels shapes the school attainment of their children. It is important to note that environmental factors have indirect influence on students’ behaviour at home and at school and therefore educationally rich situations at home would promote learning in schools and vice versa. Parents’ educational and socio-economic background promote all activities which facilitate students’ participation, these may include paying fees, providing items required by the school and hence students’ participation and retention in education.

Present study differs from Mwangi et al. (2017) in that Mwangi et al. used descriptive survey design and did not interview students who are the beneficiaries of subsidized education system and did not discuss influence of financing on students’ participation. The findings showed a positive correlation between availability and exposure to reading material at home and parental support. Current study concurs with the findings by Mwangi et al. (2017) that students’ family socio-economic status have a statistically significantly contribution in the prediction of students’ participation in secondary education. This therefore shows that family size has influence on school attendance and especially among economically disadvantaged families because decision has to be made whether to provide for basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter or to pay for education of children. In most cases the poor opt to trade off and send their children for activities that will earn some income for the family.

Most of the large families in most cases tend to have limited resources which make them live in small houses or homes. Such scenarios prevent parents from providing space for academic work for their children at home since family living rooms act as studying rooms for the students and therefore in many occasions the students have to wait until family members have cleared from the room unlike students from small size families who are provided with such facilities and have more time for academic work. Family size therefore has influence on students’ participation in secondary education since size influences the family’s ability to provide for education requirements at school.

According to Thomson (2018) parents’ educational and professional qualifications has influence on the children’s education level because the parents are immediate role model who influences the students to aim higher.

Thomson (2018) used longitudinal study design to survey the role of school-family relationships, parents’ satisfaction and their associations with academic success. Results showed positive school-family relationship as predictor of success and associations was mediated by degree of satisfaction in parents. The study concluded that school policies and practices that reinforce relationships with students’ families improves parents’ of participation which indirectly influences students motivates students to do well in school. The current study findings concur with Thomson (2018), however, the two studies vary in that Thomson (Ibid) interviewed parents who are not directly involved in school work unlike in current study where direct beneficiaries of FDSE funding policies were involved. Psacharopolous & Woodhall, (1985) and McGrath (2010), suggest that educated parents are more aware of the possible returns to their children’s education and have social networks necessary for their children to land on highly paid employment yielding high returns to them.

Demir, Kilic, & Unal (2010) in their study on influence of parents’ educational qualifications on students’ performance in mathematics tests established that students whose parents were highly educated and exposed to mathematics tended to show more success in mathematics than their peers whose parents were less educated and had not been exposed to mathematics. The results showed positive correlation because highly educated parents who know their role in relation to school work and had provided enabling environment for their children. Parents’ interest in school work is an important drive their children need to succeed in school work since they offer support when students are away from school. Demir, Kilic, & Unal (2010) used quantitative research approach and interviewed
on the effect of parents’ level of education on students’ participation established that students from parents who had higher qualifications performed better in standardized tests than those whose parents who had lower levels of education. This was attributed to parents’ involvement in school activities like open days, and support to school programmes. It is assumed that by parents participating in school programmes the students get motivated and focused on school work. In addition, it is argued that parents who have high education qualifications do provide stimulated environment at home which is replicated at school and which enhances students’ participation. Parents with high levels of education can effectively discuss with their children academic work and school programmes. Performance of students in school work largely depends on the amount of investment made in academic programmes by parents. Academic reports on students’ progress at school to parents are critical and therefore important channels of communication by which schools can mobilize parents to encourage students to participate in school related work. Educated parents can organize for private tuition sessions for their children at home with view to improving students’ performance at school. This is likely to instill positive values about education (CREATE, 2009: UNICEF, 2013). Studies by Abagi et al. (1997) & Samaz, (2014) in Kenya and Turkey respectively showed that socio-cultural practices lowered girls’ participation in secondary education and preferred to marry them off. UNICEF (2013) observes that studies have shown that parent’s level of education has a more, influence on schooling of their children, since the more educated parents are the higher they are likely to enroll them. Parents’ interest in education influence students’ participation and retention, since they are able to monitor students’ activities at school and home by providing support. Parents who have high academic qualifications especially mothers significantly reduce chances of school dropout for girls, since such parents spent more time with the daughters on school related activities than their uneducated counterparts who would make their children spend more time on domestic chores.

A study by Marbuah (2016) in Ghana on the influence of parents’ socio-economic status on students’ schooling period established that at formative stage of learning the fathers’ education qualifications had more impact on the children style and schooling motives, but the level of influence changes as children advance both in age and stage of education, given that as children advance in age they can think abstractly and make realistic decisions about the education and career choices. The key idea underscored is that intellectual maturity is critical in decision making by parents about their education as they advance in school. The gap noted here was that study by Marbuah (2016) was in both primary and secondary school levels unlike the current study that was only in secondary schools.

Alloush (2010); World Bank & UNICEF (2009) study findings in Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania and Uganda which revealed that fee abolition resulted in increase in students’ enrolment in schools among the disadvantaged students particularly the orphans and the female students. But failed to consider influence of capacity expansion of educational facilities on students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County.

The Society for International Development and the Kenya Domestic Household Survey (KDHS) (2008) carried out a survey on influence of students’ family socio-economic status enrolled secondary education in Kenya, established that, while primary school pupils were drawn from less proportionate and high income families, less than 4% of the secondary students were drawn from the poorest per capita expenditure quartile, 7.3% from the lower middle-income group, 11.4% from middle income group, 16.2% from upper middle and only 28.2% were from the upper quartile. In conclusion the Survey showed that children from the wealthy families had a better opportunity of enrolling in secondary education than those from the lower quartiles and therefore admission to secondary education in Kenya was tilted in favour of high income families.

A further survey by the same organization in 2015 also revealed that living standards of Kenyans had generally improved between 2005/06 and 2015. This was attributed to distribution of income to the aged...
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majority of the students have to wadroop out of school due to distance factors. In Siaya school a level where students can abstractly reason for participation of students in secondary education in a number of ways. A study in Ghor Province in Afghanistan by Buren et al. (2012) on the impact of constructing new schools in economically disadvantaged areas with limited number of schools established that there was an overall in enrolment by an increase of 42%. Increase in enrolment was attributed to availability of school buildings and construction of new schools. This situation brings out an important concept on students’ welfare at school. It shows that parents enroll students in secure environment and for that matter schools’ buildings and environment must be child friendly to enforce the education institutions’ accountability to parents and therefore investment schools’ infrastructure safety and students’ welfare must be put into consideration as they influence students’ participation. Long distances between home and school made parents in Bangladesh during the time of Taliban rule to pull out their children from school due to insecurity. This affected the girls’ enrolment due to Islamic traditions where girls are secluded as parents could not trust security of their girls to school. Apart from security there are indirect costs on transport that the families incur which would have been spent on basic needs such as food and health.

According to Sheldon (2012), distance factor in majority of rural schools was contributing to chronic absenteeism among students in U.S rural district schools. Sheldon (Ibid) further noted that rural areas had limited number of schools and far off so students had to traverse long distance, at times in difficult terrain and harsh weather conditions make students participation difficult especially during rainy and cold seasons. Sheldon (2012) conducted a longitudinal study on factors that were contributing to absenteeism which in turn was affecting retention of students. The findings showed that school, family and community partnership could be used to reduce chronic absenteeism. The study recommended community and parents’ partnership with community in addressing the issue was critical.

Present study was carried out in public secondary school a level where students can abstractly reason and are aware of the value of schooling and may not drop out of school due to distance factors. In Siaya majority of the students have to walk long distances between one to five kilometers daily. The Siaya CIDP, (2013) acknowledges that high poverty and unemployment affects school enrolment. Distance from home to school affects students’ enrolment in a number of ways.
referred that 20% of the children from disadvantaged families was likely to drop out due to the fact that the parents were not able to provide simulative environment for learning at home with little support in provision of other resources relevant to school work. Secondly the families had little income and preferred to trade-off between sending children to school and feeding the family. Study by Iarmosh (2013) was conducted among low income families in Russia and researched on drop out due to poverty and unstimulating home conditions. Present study was conducted in subsidized education system where effects of poverty have been addressed through provision capitation grants and most students were expected to be in school.

Opportunity cost is important in settings with low returns to secondary education particularly if the optimal returns for individuals is to forgo secondary education schooling entirely especially if the knowledge to be gained would not increase cognitive skills, or improve the individuals wellbeing. In that sense interest for secondary education will be below hence the demand for FDSE, which in turn will affect students’ participation. In Brazil and Jamaica boys in low in-come setting up often dropout of school to work in construction sites that required no secondary education qualifications because they saw that secondary education offered them no guarantee of securing employment in future (Bake et al., 2012). The cost of being in school is expensive to poor families so children are withdrawn from school so as to work and earn income for family use, which affected students’ participation rates in education. This scenario is much similar to situation in Siaya County where students abandon education and join fishing in Lake Victoria which affects students’ participation in education as acknowledged in the Siaya CIDP, (2013) that high poverty and unemployment did affect students’ participation and retention in schools in the county.

In developing countries, the opportunity cost of time spent in education by students from poor families could be quite high since the young children are expected to contribute to family income by working in the farms, fetching firewood, and looking after babies to enable adults participate in more productive work. The involvement of students in productive work denies students opportunity to participate in education. It is therefore important for education sector to give relevant curriculum content in meeting the expectations of the society and more specifically the labour market.

For instance, in Southern Africa, Lesotho and Namibia boys are taken out of school to herd cattle (Pscharopolous & Woodhall, 1985; UNESCO, 2015). Immediate economic gain in this case is more beneficial to the families. A review of literature on the influence of students’ family socio-economic status on students’ participation in secondary education shows a gap in findings which will be filled by the present study.

Methodology
The researcher used mixed methods approach and descriptive data was collected. The target population was 21,017 comprised of 276 school principals, 6 sub-county directors of education and 20,735 form iv students with a sample size of 2,160. The researcher adopted stratified simple random sampling technique to get respondents from categories of the schools. Data collection instruments were questionnaires, interview schedules and document analysis. Both descriptive and inferential data analysis methods were used in analyzing data.

Findings, Results and Discussions
Descriptive Statistics for Students’ Family Socio Economic Status
Table 4.1 details the descriptive statistics for students’ socio economic status.  
Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics on Students’ Response on Students’ Family Socio Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ income levels influences students participation</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental level of education influences students participation</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s cultural way of life is critical in students’</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Onyango (2020)
Table 4.1 shows that 1046(52.4%) of students’ strongly disagreed that parents’ income levels does not influence students’ participation in secondary education, and 951(47.6%) of the respondents agreed respectively. The findings showed that parents’ income has no influence on students’ participation in education. Findings imply that students’ participation in education depends on students’ inborn ability and parents only provide simulative environment to enable students to realize their full potential. These findings concur with ideals of Classical Liberal theory by Rousseau (1712-1778), a theory on social mobility which advocates for equality. It advances that social mobility can be promoted by equal opportunities and hence school should provide conducive environment equal opportunities to all students regardless of race, faith or social status as enshrined in Constitution of Kenya (2010).

Table 4.1 shows that, 1247(62.4%) of respondents strongly agreed that parents’ level of education influences students’ participation in education and 750(37.6%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that parents’ level of education does not influence students’ participation in secondary education. The findings revealed that 1247(62.4%) of the students believed that parental level of education would influence students’ participation in education since they have similar hereditary factors as their parents. The findings implied that genetics play great in determining participation in education, since they concur with assertions by Classical Liberal Theory by Rousseau 1712 -1778 who stated that social mobility advocates in natural state men are instinctively equal and personality qualities are inherent. The findings further lend credence to other findings by Pscharopolous & Woodhall, (1985) & Marbuah (2016) who eluded that students’ parents’ level of education has influence on educational attainment of children in education. This was due to awareness of what is expected by schools to support students’ participation

Table 4.1 shows that 1092(54.7%) of the students strongly agreed that cultural way of life has influence on students’ participation in education and 905(45.3%) disagreed that cultural way of life does not have influence on students’ participation in education. The findings showed that majority that 54.7% of students that cultural beliefs have influence on students’ participation in education. These findings concur with study findings by Buren, et.al (2012) in Bangladesh on effects of long distance during the time of Taliban rule affected school enrolment because of insecurity. The withdrawal affected the girls’ enrolment due to Islamic traditions where girls are secluded so the parents could not trust security girls to school.

Table 4.1 shows that 1,293(64.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed that long distance from home to school influences school enrolment, while 704(35.3%) of the respondents disagreed. Findings established that majority of the students 1,293(64.7%) confirmed that long distance has influence on access and retention in education. The finding implied that long distance contributes to dropout in education.

These findings concur with sentiments by Burde & Linen, (2012) who argued that long distance from home to school affect enrolment given that students arrive in school late and exhausted. The findings are in line with study findings by Sofie (2009) in Lesotho on effects of long distance between schools and students’ homes which observed that distance was a constraint to the provision of secondary education since about 44% of primary students could access to schools within 30 minutes’ walk compared to only 23% of secondary school students.

Table 4.1 shows that 1,665(83.4%) of the student agreed that students’ family socio-economic status is a major factor in access and retention whereas 332(16.6%) of the students disagreed. The findings revealed that majority 83.4% of the students agreed that there is strong correlation between family’s socio-economic status and retention in education. This implied that students from high socio-economic status families were to remain in education since the families are able to provide required support to schools and students which assist in improving environment for students’ wellbeing and academic work.

The findings are supported by the assertions of Iarmosh (2013) who alluded that parents with high socio-economic status background were supportive
since they were able to provide instructional materials and facilities which in turn influences quality of education.

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics for principals’ response on Students’ Socio Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ income levels influences students participation in secondary ed.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental level of education influences students’ participation in secondary ed.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s cultural way of life is critical in students’ participation in ed.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance from home to school influences school enrolment in Siaya County</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family socio economic status is a major factor in access and retention.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that 43(51.8%) of the principals disagreed that parents’ income level does not influence students’ participation level in education, while 40(48.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed. These findings established that the income level facilitates retention in education. High income level families are able to keep their children in school because they are capable of providing necessary requirements such as textbooks and other reading materials. They also provide conducive environment for studies at home and support school programs. While, economically disadvantaged families may not be able to provide facilitating environment for school work due to limited financial resources, given that they would also be struggling to provide for daily meals and may not have resources to spend in education and in that case, they may prefer to involve their children in income generating activities for family’s survival. These findings are in agreement with the assertions by UNESCO (2010), that family income was one of the most significant factors that influenced school enrolment rates in developing countries. It observed that the problem was common in developing countries particularly among children from poor families who were likely not to be provided with adequate educational materials, which was due to the fact that the families could not afford educational materials due to high poverty levels in the countries. Instead students would have preferred to participate in economic activities to supplement family income than going to school. The findings point out critical contribution by households in financing education.

In table 4.2 shows that 31(37.3%) of the principals disagreed that parents’ level of education does not influence students’ participation level in education whereas 52(62.7%) strongly agreed that parents’ level of education influences students’ participation level in education. The findings revealed that 62.7% of the school principals were aware of the fact that parents’ level of education has positive influence on students’ participation in education. This implied that parents with high education attainment are aware of requirements in school and do support school programmes. They work with the schools and show concern by providing space for studies and school work at home which promotes students’ participation unlike parents with low education level who may not provide support which may negatively affects students’ participation in school.

Table 4.2 shows that, 37(44.6%) of the principals disagreed that parents’ cultural way of life was not critical in students’ participation in education while 46(55.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed that parents’ cultural way of life is critical in students’ participation in education. These findings established that majority 46(55.4%) of the school principals were aware of the influence of cultural practices on students’ retention in education. The findings implied cultural practices may...
nationally influence participation in education. This therefore shows that educated parents are able to ignore cultural practices that may affect access and retention in school since they are aware of high economic returns from education to their children and to entire family and therefore they will ensure that the students stay and remain in school to acquire skills and knowledge that will make them land on well-paying careers unlike parents with low education levels that may prefer marrying off their daughters for immediate income. Such practices will negatively affect access and retention in education. Table 4.2 shows that 19(22.9%) of the principals disagreed that distance from home to schools does not influence access and retention in schools, while 64(77.1%) strongly agreed that distance from home to schools affects access and retention education. The findings established that 64(77.1%) of the school principals agreed and were aware of influence of long distance on education. This therefore implied that in setting up of educational institution have to be put into consideration as cited in registration of educational institutions guidelines (MoE,2012). These findings concur with those of Sofie (2009) in Lesotho on effects of long distance between schools and students’ homes. The findings observed that distance was a constraint to the provision of secondary education since about 44% of primary students could access to schools within 30 minutes’ walk compared to only 23% in secondary schools. Table 4.2, shows that 69(83.1%) of the principals strongly agreed that students’ family socio-economic status is a major factor in access and retention of students in education whereas 14(16.9%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that students’ family socio-economic status is not a major factor in access and retention in education. The findings established that majority 69(83.1%) of the schools were aware that family socio-economic status is major factor in retention in education. The findings therefore implied that families with low socio-economic status may not be able to retain their children in school without support of capitation, scholarship and bursary from government or other stakeholders. Statistically, family socio-economic status has significant influence on students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County. The findings were in concurrence with findings by Foko et al. (2012) who noted that household spending in 15 countries in sub-Saharan Africa between the years 2001-2007 showed that, households spend on average 4.2% of their total expenditure on education with the richest quartile spending 5.4% and the poorest quartile spending 2.6%.

Reliability Analysis for Students’ Socio Economic Status
To test for reliability of the scale used, Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient was applied. The standard reliability coefficient would be taken from Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), who suggested that in the baby stages of research on predictor tests or hypothesised measures of a construct, reliabilities of .70 or higher would be sufficient. The results are shown in table 4.27.

Table 4.2: Shows Reliability Analysis for Students’ Socio Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees Policy Guidelines on Access and Retention</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.3 show that Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for Students’ Socio Economic Status construct was 0.773; which exceeded the 0.6 lower levels of acceptability (Hair et al., 2006) and within the 0.70 and above as suggested by Nunnally (1978) and therefore reliable and acceptable for further analysis.

Factor Analysis for Students’ Socio Economic Status
To determine construct validity, Principle Component Analysis was applied. Factor loadings and communalities based on principal components analysis with Varimax rotation for five (5) items was conducted to provide best-defined factor structure for the Students’ Socio Economic Status as shown in table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Shows Factor Loadings and Communalities Based on Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ income levels affect students participation in secondary education</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents level of education affects students’ participation in secondary education. Cultural way of life is critical in the education of girl child. Distance from home to school affects school enrolment in Siaya County. Students’ family socio economic status is a major factor in access and retention.

Table 4.4 shows the communalities were all above 0.3 thresholds (Frydenberg, 1993); this confirmed that each item shared some common variance with other items on a four-point Likert scale that we used in our questionnaire. All the five items in this analysis had primary loadings over .5 thresholds (Frydenberg, 1993). Thus our dataset was acceptable for further analysis.

Correlation between Students’ Family Socio Economic Status and Students’ Participation in Siaya County

Pearson Moment Correlation coefficient was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between students’ family socio economic status and students’ participation in secondary education. The findings were as shown in table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Shows Correlation between Students’ Family Socio Economic Status and Students’ Participation in Siaya County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Participation</th>
<th>Students’ Family Socio Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.270*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the findings of table 4.29 that students’ family socio economic status has significantly moderate positive relationship with the students’ participation in secondary education (R = 0.270, p = 0.041). We can therefore conclude that Students’ socio economic status had a significantly moderate positive relationship with the students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County.

Regression Analysis

The study adopted Simple Linear Regression Model to determine how students’ socio economic status influenced students’ participation in secondary education. The model sought to test the following hypothesis:

\[ H_{04}: \text{Students’ socio economic status has no significant influence on students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County.} \]

Verses

\[ H_{14}: \text{Students’ socio economic status has a significant influence on students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County.} \]

The findings are shown in table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Simple Linear Regression between Students’ Socio Economic Status and students’ participation in Siaya County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.54578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Students’ Socio Economic Status

ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>6.365</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Students’ Participation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Students’ Socio Economic Status

Coefficients*
From the ANOVA results shown in table 4.6, it is evident that the Simple Linear Regression model well fitted the dataset \( F(1, 81) = 6.365, P = 0.014 < 0.05 \). Note that the model (students’ socio economic status) explained 6.1% of the variation in the students’ participation in public secondary schools in Siaya County (Adjusted R Square = 0.061); this indicates that as much as the 6.1% variation in the students’ participation explained by students’ socio economic status is significant, the influence is relatively weak. The results of coefficients in Table 4.6 show that students’ family socio economic status had a statistically significantly contribution in prediction of students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County, \( (B = 0.270, t = 2.523, p=0.014 <0.05) \); thus we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students’ socio economic status has a significant influence on students’ participation in public secondary education in Siaya County. Students’ socio economic status had a positive standardized beta coefficient = 0.270 in the coefficients results of table 4.5; an indication that a unit change in the students’ socio economic status is likely to result to an improvement in the students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County by 27%. The Simple Linear Regression model to predict students’ participation in secondary education in Siaya County using students’ family socio economic status is as follows:

\[
\text{Students' Participation} = 2.269 + 0.270 \times \text{Students' Socio Economic Status}
\]

These results are consistent with education policy in the USA where the federal government supports public education. The government is empowered by the Constitution Welfare clause article 1 section 8 to levy and collect revenues for the support of education. The situation in Kenya is not different from that of Japan and USA. In Canada, school fees are an integral part of the education system. Parents were to contribute to their children’s education through payment of fees (EERI, 2016). The government recognizes that some parents were sincerely not in a position to pay, so the government makes provision to ensure that a child is not denied access to education because of an honest inability to pay fees. The department of education in Canada works with school boards, parents, teachers and other partners to ensure that policies governing school fees are implemented consistently in all provinces. Information obtained from interview with SCDE on family funding and access to education showed that:

“Students’ from high socio-economic status were more likely to pay school fees and to support education programmes and initiated development by schools’ Boards of Management and other stakeholders”.

Just like in quantitative findings these views further support the assertions of famosh (2013) who alluded that parents with high socio-economic status background were supportive since they are able to provide instructional materials and facilities which in turn influences quality of education. On the same strength these findings seem to suggest that stakeholders in the country were supportive in development of schools and that was confirmed by the high level of financial assistance and infrastructure development by both public and private sectors. On the other hand parents with low education levels were less supportive. This assertion matches with comments by Pscharopolous & Woodhall, (1985) & Marbuah (2016) who all eluded that students of parents with low level education offered little support to the children at school. The involvement of stakeholders in various development programmes in schools requires that school Principals embrace collaborative planning strategies as a way to improving financing of education and management of physical facilities as Barine and Minja (2014). Apart from family income there were other sources students could use to acquire fees for their education in Siaya County. These included bursaries, scholarships from philanthropic individuals and organizations. These findings were in line with World Bank (2011) report on households’ income expenditure in education in Malaysia which reported that lowest
income quartile in Malaysia averagely spent about 18% of their annual income on out of pocket expenses in education. Expenditure on education was quite high for the poor such that some could opt not to send their children to school due to high expenses to be incurred. The findings also concur with reports cited by Siaya CIDP, 2013-2017 whereby about 40% of total population in the county living below the poverty line with high dependency due to high prevalence of HIV/AIDS and unemployment rates. The challenges affect provision of education services in that majority of the county residents cannot afford to enrol students for secondary education given that families have little income and may opt to trade-off between sending children to school and feeding the families.

Apart from parental educational levels there are other factors that influence students’ performance at school, these are like availability of infrastructure and instructional materials to be used in facilitating students’ learning and welfare programmes in Schools. These findings lead to another to the findings of Iarmosh (2013) and Marbuah (2016) in Russia which established that parents’ levels of education have influence in children’s educational outcomes. The study revealed that 20% of children from families with low educational attainment were likely to drop out of secondary education due to the fact that their parents were not able to provide simulative environment for learning at home and there is little support in provision of other resources relevant to school work.

There are factors that affect school enrolment such as distance, availability of space or accommodation and teaching and learning materials. These findings are confirmed by Burde & Linen, (2012) who argued that distance from home to school would affect school enrolment in a number of ways, for instance if students have to walk for many hours before reaching school. The findings further point to the report of the World Bank (2007) & UNESCO (2013) study which asserted that significant numbers of studies have observed that uneven distribution of educational opportunities between urban and rural environments had been an obstacle to school attendance. Lack of schools within a reasonable walking distance for those students living in rural and remote parts of the country is a serious hindrance to transition since there is a number of distracter. Students tend to get into wrong company as they walk to school. In Siaya County the distribution of schools is uneven. The

Siaya CIDP (2013-2017) report alludes that in terms of accessibility and by distance distribution to nearest public secondary school was 29.7% of the community. Since most schools are between one to five 5 kilometers and above. This influences enrolment given that many students arrive in schools exhausted and cannot concentrate on school work. There is strong correlation between family’s socio-economic status and retention in Siaya county schools. This is because high socio-economic families are able to provide required support both to schools and students to improve environment for academic work. Debbie & Cook (2004) observed that families’ social-economic status, and peer influence factors had negative impact on students’ participation in education in Texas to an extent that some of the teenagers dropped out of school before completion.

This is indicative to the point that distance between schools should be within a short walk distance as proposed by the Ministry of Education in the regulations for registration of educational institutions and the outcome of the School Mapping Exercise in 2005 so that students do not get exhausted as they seek to access education services (RoK, 2004).

Summary of the Study Findings

Finally, it was established that students’ family socio-economic status had significant influence on students’ participation in secondary in Siaya County given that parents economically endowed were able to retain their children in school. Many students walked long distance to schools in conclusion the students from economical background were unable to pay fees and thus did not enrol to the schools of their choice and most likely dropped out school which negatively influenced students’ participation in education in Siaya County.

Conclusion

On students’ family socio-economic status, the study concluded that students’ family socio-economic status had statistically significant influence on students’ participation in Public secondary schools in Siaya County. The findings also revealed that parental support had increased student participation in siaya County. In addition, parental education level and awareness of the value of education influenced their support to schools while, student was from economically advantaged families were unable to pay. The study therefore concluded that students’
retention depended on students’ family socioeconomic status.

**Recommendations**
The ministry of education should enhance capitation by reviewing the capitation grand with a view to retaining more students at school since the rate in force is not sufficient to meet the cost of education in the country.
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